

**CAPITAL PROJECTS ADVISORY
COMMITTEE
FOR EASTERN PLACER COUNTY
775 N. Lake Blvd, Tahoe City, CA 96145
County Contact, Erin Casey, 530-546-1944**

**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, July 26 – 4:30 PM
Northstar Community Services District
Conference Room
900 Northstar Drive, Northstar, CA 96161**

1. Call to Order

Committee Chair Alex Mourelatos called the meeting to order at 4:31 PM.

Committee members in attendance:

Seat #1 Business Association - Dave Wilderotter, North Lake Tahoe
Seat #2 Business Association – Krista Voosen, Donner Summit
Seat #3 Special District – Sarah Coolidge, Kings Beach/Tahoe Vista
Seat #4 Special District – John Wilcox, Squaw Valley
Seat #5 County General – Danielle Grindle, Squaw Valley
Seat #7 NLTRA – Alex Mourelatos, Tahoe Vista
Seat #8 NLTRA – Ron Parson, West Shore
Seat #9 Transportation – Jaime Wright, Eastern Placer County
Seat #11 Ski Resorts – Greg Dallas, Donner Summit
Seat #12 At-Large – David Hansen, Tahoe City/West Shore
Seat #13 At-Large – Rick Stephens, Martis Valley, North Lake Tahoe (left at 6:50 PM)

Absent:

Seat #6 County General – Mike Staudenmayer, Northstar
Seat #10 Lodging – Drew Conly, Squaw Valley

Staff in attendance: Erin Casey and Katelynn Hopkins, Placer County Executive Office, Cindy Gustafson, North Lake Tahoe Resort Association, and Judy Friedman, Recording Secretary.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Approval of July 26, 2018 Meeting Agenda PARSON/DALLAS/UNANIMOUS

4. Approval of May 31st, 2018 and June 28, 2018 Meeting Minutes Motion to approve the minutes of May 31, 2018. PARSON/STEPHENS/Motion carried with abstention from WILDEROTTER

Motion to approve the minutes of June 28, 2018. PARSON/GRINDLE/UNANIMOUS

5. Public Comment

Wilderotter asked that “affordable housing” be considered as eligible for TOT funds. Mourelatos said there were other items discussed and “parked” for future consideration. Gustafson noted there are different TOT buckets that funding could come from; the 2% approved by local voters, or the other 8% collected. Casey offered to give a presentation on how 4% of the 8%, known as the Tahoe Tourism Budget, is allocated to snow removal and other services in this area.

Squaw Valley resident David Stepner, said 60% of funds recommended by this committee have been allocated to trail related projects. He suggested the criteria in the Tourism Master Plan identifies the need to bring visitors to the area and encourage longer stays. Stepner said it seems like this committee is focused on infrastructure and not tourism.

Mourelatos reported he spoke at the recent Board of Supervisor’s meeting advocating for the purchase of the Nahas property to be used for workforce housing. However, he did question the use of TOT funds for the purchase.

6. Information Items

a. Update on July 24, 2018 Board of Supervisors Meeting – Review Board action on CAP Committee recommendation of Group 1 Projects

Casey reported on her presentation at the Board of Supervisor’s meeting, which updated the Board on the work of this Committee and its recommendations for funding. She noted the “Get Stuff Done” theme adopted by the CAP Committee. The Board unanimously supported the Committee’s recommendations on TOT allocations.

Casey also presented results of a recent voter survey regarding alternative funding sources. The survey asked if voters would support an increase in the eastern Placer County sales tax and an increase in TOT collected. Casey said survey results will inform a comprehensive funding approach to support community priorities. A Tourist Business Improvement District (TBID) will also be considered. . Gustafson gave more detail on how a TBID could work, which is a special district created within a business area and businesses agree to assess themselves. The idea of a bond was also brought up at the meeting. All possible strategies to increase funding for local projects need to be considered.

b. Tourism Master Plan Grant Program Reporting Requirement – Review progress report requirements and invoice approval process

Casey provided an overview of the contracts those receiving TOT funds will be required to sign and reporting requirements. There are measurements in place that will apply to all grantees, including quarterly progress reports and specific requirements for submitting invoices. A brief discussion followed clarifying the requirements and possible penalties, including withholding funds, if the reporting requirements are not met. All reporting documents are public and available to this Committee.

c. Group 1 Process Review – Identify lessons learned from the review of Group 1 projects for guidance with Group 2 Projects

Mourelatos reviewed the “parking lot” items identified as the Group 1 projects were being considered. The group agreed they would like to consider:

- 1) Funding capital projects versus feasibility studies
- 2) Overhead and administrative costs
- 3) Alternative funding opportunities (such as Prop 68 funds)
- 4) Timing, i.e., what do applicants need in this fiscal year
- 5) Reporting procedures and how success is measured
- 6) Rewarding applicants who have confirmed higher percentage of matching funds. Increase the match to higher than 10%. Consider incentives for projects that identify other funding sources.
- 7) Define “maintenance”
- 8) Reserve account

Discussion followed. Wilcox referred to Stepner’s comments (above) about funding Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects identified in the Tourism Master Plan. Gustafson pointed out that is a guiding document, but voters approved specific criteria when approving the additional 2%, which is what this Committee is allocating. Trails were a high priority. Discussion continued. It was agreed that the current criteria and other funding mechanisms need to be more clearly understood.

d. Reserve Account for Future Projects – Discuss reserve of Transient Occupancy Tax funds for future project proposals

Mourelatos asked that as Group 2 projects are being reviewed, the Committee remember the idea of funding some sort of reserve account for emergency or last minute projects or events, such as the Amgen. Discussion followed regarding the possibility of allocating a fixed amount or a percentage of overall funds available to a reserve fund. Casey and Gustafson explained the fund balance created when overall TOT funds collected are higher than what was anticipated in the County budget. Discussion continued as the fund balance and possible uses were clarified.

e. Committee Deliberation – Discuss ranking results for Group 2 grant proposals and possible recommendation to the Board of Supervisors

The Group 2 projects were considered. Most of the applicants revised project budgets to request less funding than was presented at the last meeting. At the end of all presentations, the Committee reconsidered each and took a consensus vote:

- **Tahoe Cross Country Lodge Replacement & Expansion**

Dallas recused himself from this discussion and vote. Stephens spoke with a Highlands resident and was told about 12 homeowners were opposed to this project. The applicant, Don Heapes, described the public outreach done to address neighbor’s concerns, including public meetings, HOA meetings, and TCPUD workshops specifically for residents of the Highlands. Although a Mitigated Negative Declaration was considered, a decision was made between the Tahoe Cross Country Ski Education Association (TCCSEA) and TCPUD (the lead agency) to complete an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to provide more studies and address potential project impacts. Wilderotter clarified that this request is for CEQA, not building costs. Discussion followed as the project, proposed locations, and environmental review were clarified. It was noted that administrative and staff costs have been removed. Those costs will be absorbed by TCPUD.

Consensus to recommend funding as requested.

- **TRWC: Truckee River Culvert Outflow and Floodplain Restoration**

Stephens said he was told additional funds would be raised. The applicant Eben Swain said if this funding request is approved, TRWC will raise additional funds. He described the work done

previously and what this project entails. Parson and Voosen felt this project, although important environmentally, does not qualify for TOT funding, other than signage. Discussion followed regarding components of the project.

Consensus to recommend not funding this project, but consider support at a later date.

Placer Parks: Squaw Valley Park- Winter Access and Trail Enhancement

Ted Rel reviewed the revised budget and project details. The project has been phased and the outlook has been removed. This request is primarily to overlay the parking lot, which is anticipated to have heavier use when the Park is made available in the winter. It was noted that the parking lot was plowed last winter as a pilot project and it was about 20% - 30% full according to monitoring done by the County.

Wright noted three projects requesting TOT funding are identified for the Park; this one, the Olympic Heritage Museum, and the covered Pavilion. She asked if the applicants have been working together. Mark Rideout from Placer County said that as the property owner, this is the only project that has been identified as a need. Mourelatos noted signage was cut from this request, which leaves only the parking lot overlay. The tourism component is signage, otherwise it's a maintenance request. Dallas and Wilderotter agreed. In response to a question, Rideout explained the Road Fund is used for maintenance, but some projects have been redlined. The County determined a nexus between this request and recreation. Rideout also explained the overlay is not maintenance because the project allows for ongoing snow removal to provide public access which is a new use of the facility. Discussion followed.

Consensus to recommend fund the project as requested, with the understanding that signage and public outreach is included.

SVSMF: Sierra Nevada Olympic Winter Sport Museum Phase IV

John Wilcox recused himself from this discussion and vote. On behalf of the applicant, Bill Clark described the proposed project and funding request. He explained the major capital campaign can begin when the design is completed. Discussion followed regarding the conversations about locating the Museum in the Park. The level of environmental review that will be required has not been determined.

Stephens left the meeting at this point.

Discussion continued. Casey informed the committee issues with the deed restriction have not been resolved as indicated by the applicant. The US Forest Service needs more information on the project before a determination is made on whether the project violates the deed restriction which prohibits commercial operations in the park. Casey also mentioned the level of environmental analysis has not been determined by Placer County who would be the lead agency for CEQA on this project. An EIR may be required. Progress reports have been submitted for the previous TOT allocation of \$125,000 as required by contract with the county. No funds have been paid to the Museum Foundation under this contract.

Consensus to recommend funding as requested.

TCDA: Heritage Bear Statue

The Committee felt this request has not been publically vetted.

Consensus to recommend not funding at this time.

Placer County FAC: Tahoe City Firehouse Properties

There was discussion between the Committee and County representatives about what the funding request would cover, public outreach, the two proposals received, and any studies that may have already been done. There were suggestions that a project would be better to fund than another study, but there was acknowledgement as to the importance of this project. The first straw vote resulted in consensus not to fund the project at this time. Discussion continued regarding the County's need to conduct feasibility studies in order to determine the best use for the property. Rideout said any rents realized from an eventual project will be reinvested in the property.

Consensus to recommend funding as requested.

Squaw Park Pavilion

Rideout said the County, property owner of Squaw Valley Park, has not received an application to use the property for this project. He believes the pavilion will fit in the park, but does not have a recommendation regarding the project proposal. A brief discussion followed regarding potential uses of the pavilion.

Consensus to recommend not funding at this time.

Tahoe Vista Vision Master Plan

Parson and Mourelatos said this idea needs to be flushed out more and is not ready to be considered for TOT funding. Although Tahoe Vista is not an identified Town Center, it's important to remember that a lot of TOT is generated in this corridor and it deserves County attention. Peter Kraatz from Placer County DPWF agreed and said he is meeting with utility companies and Caltrans to discuss improvements in the area.

Consensus to recommend not funding at this time.

7. Action Items

a. Action on reserve account for future project proposals

After the above allocation recommendation, \$105,000 remains in the fund. At a future meeting, the Committee will discuss a reserve account.

b. Action on Tourism Master Plan Group 2 grant proposals and funding requests

See above.

8. Future Agenda Items

- Housing
- Establishing a Reserve Account
- County presentation on Tahoe Tourism Budget

9. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 7:38 PM. The next regular CAP Committee meeting is scheduled for 4:30 PM on August 30, 2018, at Sugar Bowl

Respectfully submitted,
Judy Friedman
Recording Secretary